

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,453

Applicant(s)

BRUECKEN, CARL

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Zaenen et al.** ("Zaenen") (U.S. Patent 5,642,522).

Regarding claims 1, 13, and 20, **Zaenene** teaches methods for providing a computer user with an accessible electronic dictionary system, the method comprising:

a). *'receiving a data request action for a word appearing in an electronic document'* as a typical word processing program, the user can select a word by highlighting the work or placing a cursor on the work, and access a thesaurus or a dictionary (col. 2, lines 49-52);

b). *'accessing information regarding context of the word derived from within the electronic document in which the word appears'* as analyzing the selected word in the context of neighboring and surrounding words to resolve ambiguities (col. 2, lines 35-43);

c). *'accessing a definition of the word'* as an on-line reference work such as a dictionary or thesaurus (col. 2, lines 47-49; 54-57);

Art Unit: 2177

d). *'storing the definition of the word'* as number of definitions of the selected word (col. 2, lines 54-57) *'along with the context information for the word'* as a set of possible contexts of the selected word and the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 8, lines 10-13 and col. 1, lines 40-41; and

e). *'enabling access by the computer user to the definition and the context information'* as an electronic dictionary in connection with a body of electronically encoded text (col. 1, lines 8-11 and col. 2, lines 42-57).

Regarding claims 2 and 14, **Zaenene** further teaches wherein 'the context information includes at least one word that is positioned adjacent to the word within the electronic document from which the context information was retrieved' as the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 1, lines 40-43).

Regarding claims 3 and 22, **Zaenene** further teaches 'enabling access to a definition and context information for one or more other words that are related to the word when enabling access to the definition and context information for the word' as the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 1, lines 40-43 and col. 2, lines 54-57).

Regarding claims 4 and 23, **Zaenene** further teaches 'enabling access to the definition and the context information for the word includes displaying context information from more than one electronic document in which the word has appeared'

Art Unit: 2177

(col. 1, lines 40-43 and col. 2, lines 54-57). Although **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach that the context information is from more than one electronic document, it should be understood that since the electronic dictionary in the prior art is connected with the word processing system that is accessible to many users, the context information in the dictionary is most likely derived from electronic documents of various users.

Regarding claims 5 and 26, **Zaenene** further teaches 'determining a selectable level of detail for the definition to be retrieved' as allowing user to request a particular level of additional information. The smallest amount of additional information would be an additional sense of the same citation form and the greatest amount of additional information would be all the information relating to all citation forms of the selected word (col. 9, lines 14-22).

Regarding claim 24, **Zaenene** further teaches wherein 'enabling the display of the context information includes enabling the display of at least one word that is positioned adjacent to the word within the different electronic document in which the context information was derived' as the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 1, lines 35-42).

Regarding claims 29 and 31, **Zaenene** further teaches wherein 'accessing includes retrieving a portion of the definition and the context information for the word

Art Unit: 2177

from storage' as an on-line reference work such as a dictionary or thesaurus (col. 2, lines 54-57 and col. 1, lines 40-43).

Regarding claim 30, **Zaenene** further teaches wherein 'retrieving includes retrieving multiple words and corresponding contexts from storage' as multi-word combination containing the selected word are found (col. 3, lines 59-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 11, 12, 15, 19, 21, 25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zaenen et al.** ("Zaenen") (U.S. Patent 5,642,522) as applied to claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 above and in view of **Nielsen** (U.S. Patent 5,970,492).

Regarding claim 11, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach the definition and the context information for the word is stored in a manner designed to enable mobile access.

Neilsen, however, teaches the definition and the context information for the word is stored in a manner designed to enable mobile access (col. 2, lines 35-39).

Art Unit: 2177

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenene's** to share a common customized dictionary based on a wide range of network such as an Internet in order to improve the accessibility to the dictionary as indicated in col. 3, lines 24-28.

Regarding claim 12, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach wherein the definition and the context information are stored in a manner to enable future use by a computer user other than the computer user responsible for generating the data request action.

Neilsen, however, teaches the definition and the context information are stored in a manner to enable future use by a computer user other than the computer user responsible for generating the data request action (col. 2, lines 35-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenene's** to share a common customized dictionary as this would facilitate the staff to perform their work in effective an efficient manner.

Regarding claims 15 and 25, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context information for more than one word identified by a single user.

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context information for more than one word identified by a single user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen**'s teaching would have allowed **Zaenene's** to develop a personal customized dictionary for storing special words tailored to the user's profession.

Regarding claim 19, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context of information for at least one word identified by each of more than one related identity.

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context of information for at least one word identified by each of more than one related identity (col. 4, lines 20-42 and col. 11, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen**'s teaching would have allowed **Zaenene's** the ability to add new definitions and related context information to the customized dictionary based on the target community.

Regarding claim 21, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach wherein the different electronic document from which the context information was derived was previously viewed by a party submitting the data request action.

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein the different electronic document from which the context information was derived was previously viewed by a party submitting the data request action (col. 6, lines 37-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenene's** to ascertain the relevancy of the context information prior to submitting the data request action.

Regarding claim 32, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach wherein accessing the context information includes accessing the context information from a device that is distinct from a device generating the data request action.

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein *'accessing the context information includes accessing the context information from a device that is distinct from a device generating the data request action'* as accessing the context information from the vendor computers and generating the data request action from the client computers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenene's** to limit access to the context information to only authorized individuals.

5. Claims 6-10, 16-18, and 27-28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zaenen et al.** ("Zaenen") (U.S. Patent 5,642,522) as applied to claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 above and in view of **Craddock et al.** ("Craddock") (U.S. Patent 6,351,771 B1) and **Nielsen** (U.S. Patent 5,970,492)

Art Unit: 2177

Regarding claims 6, 7, and 27, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach the steps:

a). identifying a target community appropriate for the computer user inputting the data request action; and

b). selecting the definition to be stored for the word from among more than one available definition based on the target community identified.

a). **Craddock**, however, teaches 'identifying a target community appropriate for the computer user inputting the data request action' as IP address and/or user ID (col. 5, lines 11-15).

b). **Zaenene and Craddock** do not explicitly teach step selecting the definition to be stored for the word from among more than one available definition based on the target community identified.

Nielsen, however, teaches 'selecting the definition to be stored for the word from among more than one available definition' as requested by users for addition to the database of approved words (col. 4, lines 20-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Nielsen's** teaching would have allowed **Zaenene and Craddock's** to direct their requests store the definitions to the appropriate community.

Regarding claims 8 and 17, **Zaenene and Craddock** do not clearly teach determining the identification information based on an Internet Protocol address of the computer user.

Art Unit: 2177

Neilsen, however, teaches determining the identification information based on an Internet Protocol address of the computer user (col. 5, lines 11-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Nielsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenene** and **Craddock**'s to find out user's identity in order to develop the user profile based on individuals characteristics and preferences.

Regarding claims 9, 16, and 18, **Zaenene and Neilsen** do not clearly teach determining the identification information based on a screen name of the computer user.

Craddock, however, teaches '*determining the identification information based on a screen name of the computer user*' as a user ID (col. 5, lines 11-13).

Regarding claim 10, **Zaenene and Neilsen** do not clearly determining the identification information based on a user profile of the computer user.

Craddock, however, teaches '*determining the identification information based on a user profile of the computer user*' as a record which contains user subscribes services, user preferences for various possible client devices employed by that user and any other preferences of the user as well as billing information for the user (col. 5, lines 24-32).

Regarding claim 28, **Zaenene** further teaches wherein 'selecting among the definitions includes selecting based on a relationship between the target community identified and the context information' (col. 3, line 42 – col. 4, line 8).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sheppard, II (U.S. Patent 5,820,386) teaches interactive educational apparatus and method.

Change et al. (U.S. Patent 6,091,415) teaches system and method for displaying multiple dialog boxes in a window display.

Chijiwa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,085,204) teaches electronic dictionary and information display method, incorporating rotating highlight styles.

Shaw et al. (U.S. Patent 6,151,598) teaches digital dictionary with a communication system for the creating, updating, editing, storing, maintaining, referencing, and managing the digital dictionary.

Narayan (U.S. Patent 5,418,957) teaches network data dictionary.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 305-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Leslie Wong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2177

Lw
24 January 2004



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER